In re Appln. of Alan F. Savicki Application No. 09/980,444

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action dated December 30, 2003. The Office Action objected to the Response filed on October 8, 2003 because the Response did not include the argument at the August 18, 2003 interview as to why claims 188-259 would avoid the art of record. Also, the Office Action objected to the Response for not pointing out the patentable novelty which the applicant believes the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references.

During the interview on August 18, 2003, applicant's attorney suggested adding claims which were subsequently added as claims 188-259 in the Response dated October 8, 2003. The following argument was presented concerning the novelty of the proposed claims.

In the Office Action dated July 8, 2003, claim 22 was rejected under 35 § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heuvel (U.S. 6,036,364). The Office Action stated that "as to claim 22, the pin 130 of Heuvel is the latching mechanism to keep the doors in the closed position". (Page 3, lines 15-16).

In Heuvel (U.S. 6,036,364), the retainer 130 and the slider 118 are two separate components. The retainer 130 is inserted into the top of the slider 118. (Column 3, line 57). As depicted in Fig. 2, the walls 120 and 122 form a cavity 200 for receiving the retainer 130. (Column 3, lines 57-59).

In the proposed independent claim (which was subsequently added as claim 188), the claim states that the latching mechanism is integral with the slider member. This claim is in contrast to Heuvel (U.S. 6,036,364) in which the retainer 130 and the slider 118 are two separate components.

Thus, claims 188-259 are patentable.

In re Appln. of Alan F. Savicki Application No. 09/980,444

Applicant requests that the Response filed on October 8, 2003 be entered and considered along with this Response.

Conclusion

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Augustyn, Reg. No. 33,589

LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.

Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900

180 North Stetson

Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780

(312) 616-5600 (telephone)

(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: March 1, 2004